

### C. REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections and reexamination of the present application in light of the following amendments and remarks.

Claims 1, 4, and 7 are currently pending and claim 1 is currently amended.

The Office Action states:

this application is in condition for allowance except for the following formal matters:

Claim 1 includes the limitations “said source routing address for said NAT device.” While it is understood that “said source routing address” corresponds simply to the address for said NAT device, the limitation should be amended to “a source routing address” in order to remove any possible antecedent basis issues.”

Claim 1 recites the limitation “returning from said DNS server... said plurality of private addresses for said NAT data processing system and a plurality of parallel data processing systems.” While it is understood that what was meant by this limitation was returning private addresses for said NAT data processing system and returning private addresses of a plurality of parallel data processing systems (not returning the systems themselves), the limitation should be amended to show this matter.

[Office Action, p. 2]

In addition, the Office Action states that “prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm’r Pat. 1935).” [Office Action, p. 2]

Applicants amend claim 1 to amend the first instance of “source routing address” to read “a source routing address”. In addition, Applicants amend claim 1 to clarify the element of returning said plurality of private addresses to read “returning from said DNS server to said client system said plurality of private addresses comprising a private address for said NAT data processing system and additional separate private addresses of a plurality of parallel data processing systems” so that it is clear that the returned private addresses include the private address for said NAT data processing system and the private addresses for a plurality of parallel data processing systems.

In view of the amendments to claim 1 to remove any possible antecedent basis issue and to clarify that the private addresses of the plurality of parallel data processing

systems, and not the systems themselves, are returned, Applicants respectfully request a timely issue of a notice of allowance in allowed claims 1, 4 and 7.

***Conclusion***

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and the allowance of the current pending claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner feels that the pending claims could be allowed with minor changes, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to discuss an Examiner's Amendment.

No extension of time is believed to be necessary. If, however, an extension of time is required, the undersigned hereby authorizes the Commissioner to charge any fees for this extension to IBM Corporation Deposit Account No. 09-0447.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Amy J. Pattillo, Reg. No. 46,983/  
AMY J. PATTILLO  
Registration No. 46,983  
P.O. BOX 161327  
AUSTIN, TEXAS 78716  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS  
Telephone: 512-402-9820  
Facsimile: 512-306-0417